

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank the examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative during a personal interview conducted on July 8, 2010. The participants were Examiner Anwar, SPE Ferris, Daiji Ido and the undersigned. The discussion focused on claim 4 rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Vilander et al. (US Patent 6,553,219) in view of Gilchrist et al. (US Patent 7,042,855).

During the interview, the above clarifying amendments to claim 4 were discussed. These amendments are supported for example by application Fig. 6. Specifically, the signal “INTERNAL SERVER ACCESS” is transmitted (that is transmitted from the UE via the RNC to the SGSN when a session is established between the UE and the SGSN with signals from “Activate PDP Context Request” and through “Activate PDP Context Response.” It was indicated that claim 7 would be amended in a similar manner.

During the interview, the examiner and his supervisor stated that Gilchrist et al. do not appear to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 4 wherein, when the mobile communication terminal apparatus accesses the internal server while the session for packet transfer is established between the serving general packet radio service support node and the mobile communication terminal apparatus, (i) in the mobile communication terminal apparatus, over the radio access bearer, informing the serving general packet radio service support node of access of the internal server by the mobile communication terminal apparatus. A summary of the substance of the points discussed in the interview are included below.

It was noted that the Office Action cites Vilander for a packet communication method including, in the radio network control apparatus, ... , transmitting information that relates to internal server access and that is transmitted from the mobile communication terminal apparatus [UE], to the serving general packet radio service support node [SGSN], and transferring packets that are for the internal server and that are transmitted from the mobile communication terminal apparatus [UE], directly to the internal server, without involving the serving general packet radio service support node [SGSN]. The Office Action particularly cites column 3, lines 20-42 of Vilander. The Office Action states that Vilander fails to teach or suggest in the radio network control apparatus, transmitting information that relates to internal server access and that is transmitted from the mobile communication terminal apparatus [UE], to the serving general packet radio service support node [SGSN].

In contrast, present claim 4 defines in the radio network control apparatus, when the mobile communication terminal apparatus accesses the internal server while the session for packet transfer is established between the serving general packet radio service support node and the mobile communication terminal apparatus, the mobile communication terminal apparatus transmits, over the radio access bearer, informs the serving general packet radio service support node of access of the internal server by the mobile communication terminal apparatus.

On the other hand, in Vilander, there is no disclosure of informing core network 4 of any access, by mobile station 9, of gateway 8 via a base station 5 and RNC 6.

It was further noted that the discussion of Gilchrist et al. in the Office Action at page 4, last two lines through page 5, line 11 does not address the above-noted features of claim 4. It was noted that Gilchrist et al. do not add anything to the teachings of Vilander et al. to render obvious

the subject matter of claim 4.

Thus, it was noted that claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the individual or combined teachings of Vilander et al. in view of Gilchrist et al. by reciting the subject matter of "when the mobile communication terminal apparatus accesses the internal server while the session for packet transfer is established between the serving general packet radio service support node and the mobile communication terminal apparatus, (i) in the mobile communication terminal apparatus, over the radio access bearer, informing the serving general packet radio service support node of access of the internal server by the mobile communication terminal apparatus."

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 4 is allowable over Vilander et al. in view of Gilchrist et al., considered alone or together, and that apparatus claim 7 is similarly allowable. Therefore, allowance of claims 4 and 7 is deemed to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: July 16, 2010
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06108
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559